

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 449

September 20, 1995, 12:57 p.m.
Page S-13914 Temp. Record

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS/Market Promotion Program Limitations

SUBJECT: Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 1976. Cochran motion to table the Bumpers/Bryan modified amendment No. 2699.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE FAILED, 36-62

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide \$63.78 billion in new budget authority, 80 percent of which will be for mandatory spending programs, and 63 percent of which will be for food welfare programs.

The Bumpers modified amendment would make the following changes to the Market Promotion Program (MPP):

- foreign-owned corporations would not be allowed to receive MPP funds;
- only small business concerns would be eligible to receive MPP funds;
- total funding would be cut by \$40 million, from \$110 million to \$70 million; and
- agricultural cooperatives and similar associations would be considered small businesses for purposes of this amendment, regardless of their size.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Cochran moved to table the Bumpers amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: Following the vote, the amendment was adopted by voice vote.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The United States has been aggressively and successfully pursuing overseas markets for its agricultural products. The MPP has been partially responsible for the gains that have been achieved to date. Yesterday, we had a vote that showed that most Senators support the MPP. Today, instead of trying to kill the program, our colleagues are suggesting restrictions. We suggest they are not familiar enough with the program's current eligibility rules, restrictions, and safeguards to make informed suggestions. Our colleagues

(See other side)

YEAS (36)		NAYS (62)		NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (26 or 49%)	Democrats (10 or 22%)	Republicans (27 or 51%)	Democrats (35 or 78%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Ashcroft	Baucus	Abraham	Akaka	Inouye	
Bennett	Boxer	Brown	Biden	Johnston	
Bond	Daschle	Burns	Bingaman	Kennedy	
Campbell	Feinstein	Chafee	Bradley	Kerry	
Cochran	Ford	Coats	Breaux	Kohl	
Craig	Heflin	Cohen	Bryan	Lautenberg	
Domenici	Kerrey	Coverdell	Bumpers	Leahy	
Frist	Moseley-Braun	D'Amato	Byrd	Levin	
Gorton	Murray	DeWine	Conrad	Lieberman	
Gramm	Simon	Dole	Dodd	Mikulski	
Grassley		Faircloth	Dorgan	Moynihan	
Hatch		Grams	Exon	Nunn	
Helms		Gregg	Feingold	Pell	
Hutchison		Inhofe	Glenn	Reid	
Kempthorne		Jeffords	Graham	Robb	
Lott		Kassebaum	Harkin	Rockefeller	
McConnell		Kyl	Hollings	Sarbanes	
Murkowski		Lugar		Wellstone	
Packwood		Mack			
Pressler		McCain			
Shelby		Nickles			
Simpson		Roth			
Snowe		Santorum			
Specter		Smith			
Stevens		Thomas			
Thurmond		Thompson			
		Warner			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

have also proposed a \$40 million cut. The Agricultural Committee is currently considering that possibility in its efforts to meet its reconciliation instructions. We think it should be allowed to make its own decision on this matter. Senators who favored keeping the MPP should logically also be opposed to making uninformed changes to the program, and should therefore join us in tabling the Bumpers amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The Bumpers amendment would make the MPP defensible. First, the purpose of the MPP is to promote U.S. exports. We do not think that purpose is being met when we pay foreign companies to export products they make in the United States. Accordingly, this amendment would eliminate foreign eligibility under the program. Second, we do not think that giving a few million dollars to a huge multinational company with a foreign advertising budget in the tens or hundreds of millions of dollars will change that company's behavior, yet the MPP currently gives such companies millions of dollars in export assistance. This amendment, therefore, would eliminate large corporations' eligibility under the program. Third, in these tight budgetary times most Americans favor budget cuts, so this amendment would reduce funding for the MPP instead of increasing it greatly, as proposed in this bill. Fourth, and finally, we do not think it would be fair to count agricultural associations as big businesses just because they represent thousands of individual farmers. Therefore, this amendment would expressly allow agricultural associations to participate in the program. The Bumpers amendment would make four very positive changes in the MPP. We urge Senators to vote in its favor.